DOCKET NO.: 303661.01 / MSFT-2791
Application No.: 10/719,481
Office Action Dated: October 16, 2007

PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 9-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lurie et al (US 2002/0116698), hereinafter "Lurie". Claims 6-8 and 14-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lurie as applied to claims 1-5 and 9-13 above and in view of Crudele et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,973,647 B2), hereinafter "Crudele"

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-5 and 9-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lurie. Independent claim 9 has been amended to recite in part:

"providing an interface that enables a user to store a device database in a device project, *the interface allowing the user to view stored procedures and triggers currently associated with the device database and to add and delete stored procedures and triggers which are to be associated with the device database for the device project*;" (additions in bold). Support for this amendment can be found in paragraphs [0062] to [0077]. Independent claim 9 has been amended in similar fashion.

The cited Lurie and Crudele references fail to teach or suggest an interface that allows for the selection, as well as the addition and deletion of stored procedures and triggers, which are to be associated with a device database for use in the device project as recited. The above provides for a robust development environment whereby the developer has control of what procedures and triggers to include in a particular device database for use in a particular device project.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to include the features described above and also additional features including "providing an interface that enables a user to *generate a solution corresponding to development of at least one software application; generate a main device project within the solution for testing of the at least one software application;* store a device database in *the main* device project; and *generate a device setup project within the solution for deployment of a finished version of the at least one software application to the device; and automatically copying the device database from the main device project to the device setup project without receiving an explicit instruction to do so*"

(additions in bold). The cited references also fail to teach or suggest these additional features.

Given the failure of the cited references to teach or suggest the features described aabove, it is believed that independent claims 1 and 9 as well associated dependent claims 3, 5-8 and 10-16 are in condition to overcome the noted rejection and in condition for allowance.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 6-8 and 14-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lurie as applied to claims 1-5 and 9-13 above and in view of Crudele.

Independent claims 17 and 22 have been amended to recite in part:

"providing an interface that enables a user to select an installation property for installing the device database on the device, the selected installation property being one of an always overwrite property, an overwrite if different property, and a never overwrite property, *the interface also allows the user to select from amongst one or more stored procedures and triggers to be associated with the device database*".

Support for this amendment can be found in paragraphs [0062] to [0077]. As mentioned in the specification the development interface allows the user to associated one or more stored procedures and triggers with the device database. The interface may provide a view of all stored procedures and triggers that are associated with the device database and can be used to add or delete stored procedures and triggers. Neither the cited Lurie or the cited Crudele references taken individually or in combination teach or suggest an interface as recited in independent claims 17 and 22, as such it is believed that independent claims 17 and 22 dependent claims 18-21 and 23-26 which add further nonobvious limitations are in condition for allowance.

DOCKET NO.: 303661.01 / MSFT-2791
Application No.: 10/719,481
Office Action Dated: October 16, 2007

PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: October 31, 2007

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/
Kenneth R. Eiferman
Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439